



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,906	10/12/2001	Kenji Fukasawa	MIPFP004	8972
7590	12/06/2006		EXAMINER	
Peter B. Martine MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP 710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170 Sunnyvale, CA 94085			ROHWER, JACOB P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/974,906	FUKASAWA, KENJI
	Examiner Jacob P. Rohwer	Art Unit 2625

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Note below.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____



MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Note: The amended independent claims 1, 10, 13, 17, 19, 33, 49, 65 and 71 further limit the claims based on the facts that the use information if given to the image data by the generating device as specified. As a result this amendment would require further consideration and search in order to determine patentability. Furthermore, applicant first argues that the combination of Pritchett in view of Usami does not raise a prima facie case of obviousness in regard to how the Pritchett Reference discloses converting a color from a first color space to a second color space through the use of an extended color space and how the Usami Reference discloses a technique premised on color space compression. In response, examiner refers applicant to a previously cited disclosure in Usami, Col 11 Lin 46-55, where "a color space compression process for broadening the color reproduction range may be used" is specified. In light of this disclosure, the Usami and Pritchett both teach expanding a color reproduction range and are therefore combinable. The remainder of the arguments (independent and dependent claims) stem from this issue discussing the combination of the two references as specified above.

Furthermore, applicant argues that none of the Pritchett, Usami, Ito and Roberts References discloses or suggests using different gamma correction values for two pieces of image data that respectively contain positive color representation values and negative color representation values, as specified in claims 9 and 24. In response, examiner notes that this point has been addressed in the previous office action in the rejection of claim 5 as referenced in the rejections of claims 9 and 24, and that official notice has been taken that different colors and different input data values use different gamma correction values when converting from one color space to another. Further, in response to the final action, applicant has argued examiner's assertion in the official notice and the prima facie case of obviousness against the subject matter defined. However, as set forth in the MPEP § 2144.03, applicant failed to challenge examiner assertion of official notice in the previous response, and as a result, the assertion was taken to be well-known prior art. Therefore, evidence will not be provided supporting examiner's position in this Advisory Action, since a Final Rejection has already been issued.